

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking)	
18 FCC Rcd 13187, 13188 ¶1 (2003))	ET Docket No. 03-137
)	
And)	
)	
Service Rules for the Advanced Wireless Services)	WT Docket No. 12-357
H Block---Implementing Section 6401 of the)	
Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of)	
2012 Related to the 1915-1920 MHz and)	
1995-2000 MHz Bands ¶53 footnote 95)	

To: Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

Comment Filed by: Emily Roberson
132 Linden Ave, Apt 5
Rutledge PA 19070
ER79000@yahoo.com
610-707-1602

February 6, 2013

AFFIDAVIT OF Michael Schwaebe, PE, BBEC

State of Pennsylvania

Delaware County

I, Emily Roberson attest that my statements are true to the best of my knowledge.

Comment round for ET Docket No. 03-137 and WT Docket No. 12-357.

1. My name is Emily Roberson. My address is 132 Linden Ave, Rutledge PA 19070.

2. I am an administrative assistant.

3. and onward. When I discuss the issue of health effects from electromagnetic radiation and radiofrequency radiation with people, what I find most everyone assumes is that the FCC has taken human health into consideration in the creation of it's safety guidelines. When I explain that current FCC guidelines are based solely on thermal heating effects and take no further consideration of biological affect, people are shocked and often don't believe me until I show them information backing this up.

To most people, the single most important factor to consider in creating safety guidelines for radiation emitting devices is human health, followed then by environmental effects. Much farther down the list is interference with radio, TV and internet transmissions, which the FCC does actually consider in it's guidelines.

To the vast majority of citizens, it is clear as day that FCC guidelines needs to exercise the precautionary principle (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Precautionary_principle) with a technology that is still so relatively new and potentially harmful to human and environmental health.

FCC guidelines also need to take into consideration the layering affect, as most people now do not use one wireless device, but many. Cell phones, Wi-Fi, cordless phones, wireless printers, wireless video games, wireless utility meters, etc. What effect does it have to be exposed to numerous devices, although each individual device may conform to current FCC guidelines?

This is especially important in relationship to children, in school and at home. Which is why the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) recently sent a letter to the FCC requesting a re-evaluation of FCC guidelines around radiofrequency radiation

(<http://www.scribd.com/doc/104230961/American-Academy-of-Pediatrics-letter-to-the-FCC>).

I believe it is imperative that the FCC revisit current safety guidelines and take biological and environmental effects into consideration as the primary concern. The public already assumes the FCC has done this. The public either needs the FCC guidelines to be heightened to the extent that actually protects us, our health, our children, and our environment, or they need to know that this agency has failed to protect them and what they hold most important.

Respectfully submitted by

Emily Roberson
132 Linden Ave, Apt 5
Rutledge Pa 19070
610-707-1602
February 6, 2013